



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/098,676	03/15/2002	Jeremy P.J. Hughes	GB920010032US1	5691

25259 7590 01/24/2007
IBM CORPORATION
3039 CORNWALLIS RD.
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

SHAW, YIN CHEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/098,676

Applicant(s)

HUGHES ET AL.

Examiner

Yin-Chen Shaw

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/2002-05/2002.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-34 have been submitted for examination.
2. Claims 1-34 have been examined and rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 4-5, 9-10, 20-21, 25-26, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

- a. Claims 4-5 and 20-21 recite the limitation on the determining step that creates a useful, concrete, and tangible result only both *if* conditions recited in these claims occur or are satisfied. However, failure in further providing the limitations on the circumstances when either *if* the conditions recited in these claims do not occur or are not satisfied create a result that is intangible. Therefore, Claims 4-5 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for reciting non-statutory subject matter.

- b. Claims 9-10 and 25-26 recite the limitation on the determining step that creates a useful, concrete, and tangible result only *if* conditions recited in these claims occur or are satisfied. However, failure in further providing the limitations on the circumstances when *if* the conditions recited in these claims do not occur or are not satisfied

Art Unit: 2135

create a result that is intangible. Therefore, Claims 9-10 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for reciting non-statutory subject matter.

- c. Claim 34 claims recite limitation on functional descriptive material involving computer-readable medium without providing interrelation to a technological art, environment or machine, which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under. Therefore, Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for reciting non-statutory matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 16-18, and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muret et al. (U.S. Patent 6,792,458) and further in view of Obata et al. (U.S. Pub. 2005/0165778).

a. Referring to Claims 1, 17, 33, and 34:

As per Claim 1, Muret et al. disclose a method of controlling access to information in a distributed data processing system having:

a server for storing said information, wherein said server further comprises a logging tool for creating a log file **[(lines 64-67, Col. 3; lines 1-2, Col. 4; lines 16-22, Col. 2 , Col. 2 from Muret et al.)]**, and a client computer comprising an application program for controlling a software agent, wherein said software agent requests said information from said server **[(lines 61-66, Col. 22 and lines 1-3, Col. 23 from Muret et al.)]**, said method comprising the steps of:

identifying a software agent **[(line 65, Col. 22 from Muret et al.)]**;

in response to said identifying step, storing all requests from said identified software agent in said log file **[(lines 44-47, Co. 8 and lines 45-52, Col. 22 from Muret et al.)]**;

in response to said storing step, analysing said log file **[(lines 5-9, Col. 7 and lines 45-52 and 61-62, Col. 22 from Muret et al.)]**;

in response to said analysing step, monitoring behaviour of said identified software agent **[(lines 16-22, Col. 2 , Col. 2 and lines 28-31, Col. 22 from Muret et al.)]**, and

Muret et al. do not expressly disclose the remaining limitation of the claim. However, Obata et al. disclose in response to said monitoring step, invoking at least one of a plurality of pre-defined rules to control said behaviour of said identified software agent **[(lines 1-6 of [0007] from Obata et al.)]**. Muret et al. and Obata et al. are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al. with Obata et al. to have rules for controlling the software crawler since one would have been motivated to optimize a Web crawler's use of computer resources when performing adaptive incremental Web crawls to maintain the synchronization (lines 4-7 of [0010] from Obata et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al. with Obata et al. to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 1.

As per Claim 17, it is a system claim that corresponds to the method Claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 1 above.

As per Claim 33, it is a distributed data processing system claim that corresponds to the method Claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 1 above.

As per Claim 34, it is a computer readable medium claim that corresponds to the method Claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 1 above.

b. Referring to Claims 2 and 18:

As per Claim 2, Muret et al. and Obata et al. disclose the method according to claim 1, wherein said information is represented within any number of a plurality of web pages **[(lines 7-14, Col. 4 from Muret et al.)]**, each of said any number of a plurality of web pages comprising a non-visible link **[(lines 45-53 and 65-67, Col. 20 and line 1, Col. 21 from Muret et al.)]**.

As per Claim 18, the rejection of Claim 17 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 18 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 2. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 2 above.

c. Referring to Claims 16 and 32:

As per Claim 16, Muret et al. and Obata et al. disclose the method according to claim 1, wherein said at least one of a plurality of

pre-defined rules controls a plurality of thread priorities associated with said server, wherein at least one of a plurality of threads is associated with a software agent **[(lines 49-54, Col. 11; lines 65-67, Col. 22 from Muret et al.) and (lines 1-6 of [0007] from Obata et al.)]**.

As per Claim 32, the rejection of Claim 17 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 32 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 16. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 16 above.

5. Claims 3-7, 14-15, 19-23, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muret et al. (U.S. Patent 6,792,458) and Obata et al. (U.S. Pub. 2005/0165778), and further in view of Pettersen (U.S. Patent 6,826, 594).

a. Referring to Claims 3 and 19:

As per Claim 3, Muret et al. and Obata et al. disclose the method according to claim 2, wherein a software agent requests one of a plurality of web pages **[(lines 61-66, Col. 22 and lines 1-3, Col. 23)]**. Muret et al. and Obata et al. disclose the identifying step as in Claim 1. However, Muret et al. and Obata et al. do not expressly disclose the remaining limitations of the claim. However, Pettersen discloses said identifying step further

comprises the steps of: dynamically generating a first unique identifier and dynamically inserting said first unique identifier into a non-visible link associated with said one of a plurality of web pages **[(lines 1-6, Col. 14 and lines 26-30, Col. 14 from Pettersen)]**, and

determining whether said one of a plurality of web pages is associated with further of a plurality of web pages **[(lines 46-48, Col. 13; lines 26-40, Col. 14; lines 16-25, Col. 15 from Pettersen)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen since one would have been motivated to insert dynamic or variable type content from a web server into a designated portion of a web page over a distributed electronic network, such as the Internet (lines 3-6, Col. 4 from Pettersen et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 3.

As per Claim 19, the rejection of Claim 18 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 19 encompasses limitations that are similar to

those of Claim 3. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 3 above.

b. Referring to Claims 4 and 20:

As per Claim 4, Muret et al., Obata et al, and Pettersen disclose the method according to claim 3, wherein:

if said determining step is successful, said first identifier is dynamically inserted into further non-visible links **[(lines 26-30, Col. 14 and lines 42-47, Col. 14 from Petteresn)]**.

As per Claim 20, the rejection of Claim 19 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 20 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 4. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 4 above.

c. Referring to Claims 5 and 21:

As per Claim 5, Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen disclose the method according to claim 3, wherein if said determining step is not successful, said identifying step further comprises the steps of:

sending said one of a plurality of web pages to said identified software agent **[(lines 61-66, Col. 22 and lines 1-3, Col. 23 from Muret et al.) and (lines 26-40, Col. 14 from Pettersen)]**;

in response to said sending step, requesting, from said server by said identified software agent, any number of a plurality of links

associated with said one of a plurality of web pages **[(lines 61-66, Col. 22 and lines 1-3, Col. 23 from Muret et al.) and (lines 46-52, Col. 13 and lines 26-40, Col. 14 from Pettersen)]**;

in response to said requesting step, extracting, by said identified software agent, said any number of a plurality of links **[(lines 61-66, Col. 22 and lines 1-3, Col. 23 from Muret et al.) and (lines 1-6, Col. 14 from Pettersen)]**;

in response to said extracting step, passing, by said identified software agent, said any number of a plurality of links to said client application program **[(lines 61-66, Col. 22 and lines 1-3, Col. 23; lines 9-13, Col. 19 from Muret et al.)]**, and

in response to said passing step, determining, by said client application program, which of said any number of a plurality of links to display **[(lines 62-67, Col. 5; lines 9-13, Col. 19 from Muret et al.)]**.

As per Claim 21, the rejection of Claim 19 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 21 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 5. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 5 above.

d. Referring to Claims 6 and 22:

As per Claim 6, Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen disclose the method according to claim 5, wherein said any number of a

plurality of links is displayed within a web browsing session running on said client computer **[(lines 62-67, Col. 5; lines 9-13, Col. 19; lines 5-13, Col. 24 from Muret et al.)]**.

As per Claim 22, the rejection of Claim 21 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 22 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 6. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 6 above.

e. Referring to Claims 7 and 23:

As per Claim 7, Muret et al. and Obata et al. disclose the method according to claim 1, wherein said analysing step. Muret et al. and Obata et al. do not expressly disclose the remaining limitations of the claim. However, Pettersen discloses identifying a first value associated with said any number of a plurality of web pages and a second value associated with said further of a plurality of web pages **[(lines 35-55, Col. 10 from Pettersen)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen since one would have been motivated to insert dynamic or variable type content from a web server into a designated

portion of a web page over a distributed electronic network, such as the Internet (lines 3-6, Col. 4 from Pettersen et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 7.

As per Claim 23, the rejection of Claim 17 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 23 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 7. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 7 above.

f. Referring to Claims 14 and 30:

As per Claim 14, Muret et al. and Obata et al. disclose the method according to claim 2. Muret et al. and Obata et al. do not expressly disclose the remaining limitations of the claim. However, Pettersen discloses wherein a second unique identifier is generated and further inserted into a non-visible link **[(lines 60-61, Col. 13, lines 1-6 and 26-30, Col. 14 from Pettersen)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen since one would have been motivated to insert dynamic or variable type content from a web server into a designated

portion of a web page over a distributed electronic network, such as the Internet (lines 3-6, Col. 4 from Pettersen et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 14.

As per Claim 30, the rejection of Claim 18 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 30 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 14. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 14 above.

g. Referring to Claims 15 and 31:

As per Claim 15, Muret et al. and Obata et al. disclose the method according to claim 1. Muret et al. and Obata et al. do not expressly disclose the remaining limitations of the claim. However, Pettersen discloses wherein said distributed data processing system further comprises an application server **[(lines 34-40, Col. 12 from Pettersen)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen since one would have been motivated to insert dynamic or variable type content from a web server into a designated portion of a web

page over a distributed electronic network, such as the Internet (lines 3-6, Col. 4 from Pettersen et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 15.

As per Claim 31, the rejection of Claim 17 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 31 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 15. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 15 above.

6. Claims 8 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muret et al. (U.S. Patent 6,792,458), Obata et al. (U.S. Pub. 2005/0165778), Pettersen (U.S. Patent 6,826,594), and further in view of Meyerzon et al. (U.S. Patent 6,638,314).

a. Referring to Claims 8 and 24:

As per Claim 8, Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen disclose the method according to claim 7, wherein said monitoring step further comprises the steps of:

Pettersen further discloses said first and second values in Claim 7. Pettersen does not expressly disclose the remaining limitations of the claim. However, Meyerzon et al. disclose utilising said first and second values to generate a third value, wherein said third

value is associated with said identified software agent **[(lines 28-48, Col. 10 from Meyerzon et al.)]**, and
utilising said third value and a fourth value associated with said all requests, to associate said first identifier and said identified software agent with a fifth value, wherein said fifth value is associated with a probability **[(lines 45-67, Col. 10; lines 1-5, Col. 13 from Meyerzon et al.)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen with Meyerzon et al. since one would have been motivated to perform a Web crawl, by retrieving a set of electronic documents and subsequently retrieving additional electronic documents based on addresses specified within each electronic document (lines 22-25, Col. 2 from Meyerzon et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen with Meyerzon et al. to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 8.

As per Claim 24, the rejection of Claim 23 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 24 encompasses limitations that are similar to

those of Claim 8. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 8 above.

7. Claims 9-10 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muret et al. (U.S. Patent 6,792,458), Obata et al. (U.S. Pub. 2005/0165778), Pettersen (U.S. Patent 6,826,594), and Meyerzon et al. (U.S. Patent 6,638,314), and further in view of Proctor (U.S. Patent 6,530,024).

a. Referring to Claims 9 and 25:

As per Claim 9, Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. disclose the method according to claim 8, wherein said log file is analysed further **[(lines 5-9, Col. 7 and lines 45-52 and 61-62, Col. 22 from Muret et al.)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon do not expressly disclose if said third value is not more than or equal to a first pre-determined threshold. However, Proctor discloses less than or equal to a threshold value **[(lines 7-11, Col. 10 from Proctor)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. with Proctor since one would have

been motivated to adapt security procedures based on computing environment activity (lines 8-9, Col. 1 from Proctor). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. with Proctor to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 9.

As per Claim 25, the rejection of Claim 24 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 25 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 9. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 9 above.

b. Referring to Claims 10 and 26:

As per Claim 10, Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. disclose the method according to claim 8, wherein said log file is analysed further **[(lines 5-9, Col. 7 and lines 45-52 and 61-62, Col. 22 from Muret et al.)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon do not expressly disclose if said fourth value is not more than or equal to a second pre-determined threshold. However, Proctor discloses less than or equal to a threshold value **[(lines 7-11, Col. 10 from Proctor)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Art Unit: 2135

invention was made to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. with Proctor since one would have been motivated to adapt security procedures based on computing environment activity (lines 8-9, Col. 1 from Proctor). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. with Proctor to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 10.

As per Claim 26, the rejection of Claim 24 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 26 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 10. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 10 above.

8. Claims 11-13 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muret et al. (U.S. Patent 6,792,458), Obata et al. (U.S. Pub. 2005/0165778), and Pettersen (U.S. Patent 6,826,594), and further in view of Proctor (U.S. Patent 6,530,024).

a. Referring to Claims 11 and 27:

As per Claim 11, Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen disclose the method according to claim 7, wherein said identified software agent is associated with a profile, said profile comprising any number of a plurality of data fields unique to said identified

software agent, wherein said invoking step further comprises the steps of:

Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen do not expressly disclose the remaining limitations of the claim. However, Proctor discloses associating said any number of a plurality of data fields with said at least one of a plurality of pre-defined rules **[(lines 11-18, Col. 16 from Proctor)]**, and determining whether a pre-defined response needs to be activated, and in response to a successful determining step, activating said pre-defined response **[(lines 51-60, Col. 2 from Proctor)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen with Proctor since one would have been motivated to adapt security procedures based on computing environment activity (lines 8-9, Col. 1 from Proctor). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen with Proctor to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 11.

As per Claim 27, the rejection of Claim 23 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 27 encompasses limitations that are similar to

those of Claim 11. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 11 above.

b. Referring to Claims 12 and 28:

As per Claim 12, Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen, and Proctor disclose the method according to claim 11, wherein said log file further stores an address associated with a software agent and a name associated with said software agent **[(lines 58-65, Col. 6 and lines 61-67, Col. 22 from Muret et al.)]**.

As per Claim 28, the rejection of Claim 27 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 28 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 12. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 12 above.

c. Referring to Claims 13 and 29:

As per Claim 13, Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen, and Proctor disclose the method according to claim 12, wherein at least one of said any number of a plurality of data fields is extracted from said log file **[(lines 20-26, Col. 6 from Muret et al.)]**.

As per Claim 29, the rejection of Claim 28 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 29 encompasses limitations that are similar to

those of Claim 13. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 13 above.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Janosik, Jr. et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0156836) disclose an Internet gateway server for dynamically loading a database with data extracted from selected header fields and the body of inbound and outbound HTTP messages exchanged between one or more servers and the Web browsers which connect with those servers. The gateway server or "WebJacket" is interposed in the communications pathway between the server(s) and client(s) receiving each of inbound messages from a client and forwarding the received inbound messages to the server(s). The WebJacket extracts a first selected set of data contained in predetermined ones of said inbound messages and storing this incoming message data in predetermined locations in a relational database. The WebJacket further receives, stores and forwards each outbound message from the server(s) and extracts a second selected set of data from the outbound messages. To speed performance, the WebJacket uses multithreaded processes to forward each message to its destination before or while the content of that

message is being posted into the database. The specific information to be saved from each message, and the database location where it is to reside, is specified by configuration data accepted from a user in advance of handling the messages. When the message content is not sufficient to uniquely identify each client that initiated a given request/response exchange, client identification data is inserted into the outbound message in a "set-cookie" header instruction so that all messages to or from a given client may thereafter be identified. The configuration data identifies messages which already include cookie data which is adequate to identify the client.

- b. Allen et al. (U.S. Pub. 2004/0260722) disclose herein is described an implementation of a Web address converter, which helps dynamic Web sites get the attention of spiders of Internet search engines. With the Web address converter, requests from Web browsers using static addresses access corresponding dynamic Web pages and requests from search engines generate an instance of a Web page having links with static addresses pointing to corresponding dynamic Web pages. The Web address converter performs both Dynamic-to-Static (D-to-S) address conversion and Static-to-Dynamic (S-to-D) address conversion. D-to-S address conversion is done when generating a spider-friendly main page for a spider of a search engine to crawl. S-to-D address conversion is

Art Unit: 2135

used when a browser uses a static address to access a corresponding dynamic Web page. The static address that the browser uses was originally created when the spider-friendly main page was generated.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yin-Chen Shaw whose telephone number is 571-272-8593. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 4:30 M-F. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Yen Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

YCS

Jan. 08, 2007



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100